

February 17, 1976

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Thank you. Now, Senator Murphy, I just asked Senator Chambers what he thought would happen and what was possible with a Constitutional Convention. He said anything goes, any amendments. Now as the other co-introducer and prime mover, what do you believe can happen?

SENATOR MURPHY: That's a lovely misstatement. Senator Chambers name is not on the resolution and you know it, Senator Lewis. I'm a little ashamed of you for playing that game. However, the resolution speaks for itself. I think we have belabored, and belabored, and belabored. The wording is there, it is specific. There is no occasion to believe it will not remain specific. It conforms to the requirements of petitioning Congress for a Constitutional Convention right down to the letter of whom the request shall be delivered to in both houses of Congress, Senator. Don't play the game of Senator Chambers and Senator Murphy's resolution. I think it's rather unfair.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, if I misstated the....

SENATOR MURPHY: You did.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: ... the mechanics of it I apologize. The prime movers on this floor for this resolution have been Senator Chambers and Senator Murphy, floor debate will show that. They are the ones that want it the most. They want it the most for two different reasons. Senator Chambers wants to rewrite the Constitution of the United States. I don't think that's very good. I'm not in favor of that. Senator Murphy wants it so that he can prove that he thinks Congress is irresponsible. I've offered Senator Murphy this opportunity, that Congressional seat in the first district's up this time. Please run, please change it. I'll speak great words for you which will influence about a half a person.

But, Mr. President, nobody knows what this Constitutional Convention is about. Nobody knows what's going to happen. The more we get involved in this the bigger fools we look like. I think what needs to happen with the resolution, I'm not going to call it the Chambers-Murphy resolution, but with the resolution most prominently proposed, most prominently advocated by Senator Chambers and Senator Murphy. I don't think that's a misstatement, but they're doing it for two different reasons and that, frankly, frightens me a little bit. It's not as well defined and well cut as Senator Murphy says. I think that a number of you that introduced this resolution did a favor by calling attention to this particular problem. I think you've done your job. It is no crime now to say we've had a full debate on this issue. Congress has thusly been warned, and some of our own may run to straighten it out. We can let it ride at that without developing anything else.

If we go much further many of us could qualify for clowns and Ringling Brothers Barnum and Bailey, whatever that circus is and I don't prefer to have that role. I just think we don't advance the resolution now. If that senti-